

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the Official Action dated February 5, 2007. This amendment and request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive thereto.

Applicant is thankful for the indication of allowability regarding claims 1-4, 6-7, & 9-10 and the withdrawal of the substantive rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 & 103. This response is intended to place the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 5 & 8 were rejected under 35 U.S. C. 112 for containing indefinite language; specifically failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the recited "armature disk carrier." Applicant has amended claims 5 & 8 to depend from claim 4 as suggested by the Examiner. It is noted that both claims 5 & 8 previously depended from claim 4. Thus, no new issues have been raised by this amendment.

Applicant also confirms the Examiner's understanding regarding the second set of claims 9-10. The first set of claims regarding the method claims have been removed in favor of claims 9-10 directed to the clutch, as opposed to the method.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-10 now define the invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/516,363
In re Bittner et al.
Reply to Office Action of February 5, 2007

Should the Examiner believe further discussion regarding the above claim language would expedite prosecution they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Berenato, White & Stavish

By: 

Matthew F. Johnston
Reg. No 41,096

6550 Rock Spring Drive, Suite 240
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
Tel. (301) 896-0600